

Initial consultation**1. Parish Council**

- Supports proposed amendments to boundary.
- The dovecote in the 'Paddock' in Hunts Lane is not included in the Conservation Area, and consideration should be given to this.
- p.4: penultimate paragraph – there has been no planning permission granted for 35 units at The Crescent.
- The whole of Edmonds Drive Avenue should be in the Conservation Area (not the north side only). TPO's only give limited protection.
- The orchard which is the extension of the field between No 6 & No 8, High Street should be included in the Conservation Area (Discussed at planning meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020)

- Support noted.
- Noted – will undertake site visit and re-consult if deemed worthy of inclusion.
- Correct, will amend as necessary at time of adoption. 6, The Crescent (Ref: 2017/0564/ful)
- Edmonds Drive has been reviewed and now all of it is included in the conservation area. TPOs gives greater protection than CA designation.
- The Orchard has limited value in terms of character/streetscape on High Street. Forms part of setting of No.8 as opposed to CA value.

**2. Historic England**

- We do not provide detailed advice on every appraisal due to resource implications, if there are specific

- Noted

issues that would merit our closer involvement on this occasion please advise us of this.

### **3. Ketton and Tinwell NDP**

- Supportive of extensions.
- Query the inclusion of the lab building as it is contrary to approval for demolition on the site.
- A number of proposed amendments regarding points of detail such as addresses etc. Document to be amended taking into account these details. Suggestion too that the addresses on the HER are updated.

- Support noted.
- Confirmed lab building did not form part of our proposals and was included in error.
- Amendments noted. Regarding names of buildings, where these are designations for clarity it is always best to refer to how they are in the national heritage list. Any updates to designations/amendments should be sent to Historic England (HE). Regarding the addresses on the HER gazetteer, again, for accuracy it is better to refer to the names referenced within the gazetteer. If an address needs to be updated any amendments/changes should be submitted to Historic England (HE).

### **4. Savills, agents for Hanson cement**

- The character of the buildings on Ketco Avenue is separate to that of the wider Conservation Area; and

- Objection noted -- Ketco Avenue/office building has

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The link between the village and the quarry to the north pertain more closely to the quarry itself, rather than the cement works, which was only developed after 1928 – Therefore the report confirms there is no justification for the conservation area and we object to the proposal.</li> <li>It would be undesirable to place additional operational burdens on this strategically important employment site.</li> </ul>	<p>now been removed from proposals following 'mini-consultation'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>5. Barker Storey Matthews – agent representing owners of land between No.6 and No.8 High Street and No.6 The Crescent</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to exclude the Lab buildings from proposals, in line with the existing approval on the site.</li> <li>Request to exclude the portion of field between No.6 and 8 High Street. As the front part of the site is already within the CA it is incumbent on the LPA to take into account the impact that any future proposals on adjacent land might have on the character and setting of the CA and heritage assets. Given this requirement and the allocation in our opinion there is no need to extend the conservation area in this location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lab building did not form part of our proposals and was included in error.</li> <li>Objection noted. The main issue we need to consider is whether the land is of sufficient architectural/historic interest to designate under S.72 in accordance with the Act. As the lower portion of the field has already been designated, and the upper portion of the field is of equal interest to the lower portion of the field we would be failing our statutory duties not to designate. The proposal will allow for the boundary to be rationalized in accordance with property boundaries and preserve an</li> </ul>

	important green buffer in the street scene.
<p><b><u>Representation 6:</u></b></p> <p>Formally object to extend the CA to include Paddock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backland site and does not relate to the character of character area 4.</li> <li>• Not sufficient justification for inclusion</li> <li>• Goes against Rutland Town and Village appraisals update (June 2013)</li> <li>• The Rutland 2017 “Review of Open Space and Frontages” (July 2017) did not even assess the site when considering new proposals for open space.</li> <li>• Additionally, extant NPPF Policy states Local Green Space (referred to as Important Open Space within the Document) “should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated” (Para 99.) A conservation area appraisal does not form part of the Local Plan (which has stalled in its Review process due to the emergence of two new towns) and therefore cannot lawfully designate Local Green Space on this basis.</li> <li>• In any event, the Paddock does not fulfil the NPPF requirements to be designated as Local Green Space. Paragraph 100 states, inter alia, Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is “demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection noted</li> <li>• Whilst it is classed as being part of character area 4 it does have a unique character, separate to that of the main street frontage; that however does not diminish its interest. Part of the historic character of the village includes areas of open space, or former burgage plots to the rear of buildings that retain their historic plot layout. The term ‘important area of open space’ relates specifically to the conservation area appraisal and is not a designation in its own right within the local plan.</li> <li>• We are not proposing to designate it a ‘local green space’, but regarding it as ‘an important area of open space’ in terms of the conservation area.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Representation 7:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I’m all for extending the Ketton ‘Conservation Area’, but are we good at managing them? Recent developments on the Green make a mockery of its heritage, I refer to the alterations to No 1 (which was</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of conservation area designation is not to control</li> </ul>

built in the early 19th century) and the development of its previously large garden. The original plans were barely acceptable for a conservation area, but since then there have been continual amendments and extensions to the plans, making a mockery of the word conservation.

development but to ensure that development proposals take into account the contribution that a building/feature makes to the conservation area. It must be noted that there may be a number of works which can be undertaken which is classed as permitted development, even if you live in a conservation area. The Council may wish to implement an article 4 direction if inappropriate development deemed permitted is eroding the character of the conservation area.

- The appraisal will provide an up to date evidence base to help inform development proposals and to help development control officers and conservation officers make planning judgements giving regard to the heritage interest of the area.

#### Representation 8:

- We have no issues with the proposals, and indeed welcome them, but would like clarification on the inclusion of Chater Field (the field between No 6 and No 8 High Street Ketton) - does this include the orchard attached to the field and behind 'Barn House'? This orchard contains some fruit trees that are at least 70 years old and is the reason that No 8 High Street is named 'Orchard House'. This orchard has been surveyed and varieties identified by Stamford Community Orchard Group

- Support noted for proposals.
- The proposals do not include the field behind Barn House. Whilst the fruit trees may contribute towards the setting of the listed building they do not form a central element of the

townscape character along High Street. The trees act as a feature which forms the backdrop to the listed building and do not make a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area.

### **Representation 9**

- I have read the recent “Draft for Consultation” and have concerns about the tree lined avenue at Edmonds Road.
- In both the existing conservation area and the proposed area, it appears that only the northern side of the avenue is included in the conservation area.
- I would therefore ask that the southern side of the avenue be included in the conservation area.

- Site assessment undertaken and proposal amended to include all of the tree lined avenue at Edmonds Road, with trees on both sides of the road. This was included in the ‘mini consultation’.

### **Representation 10:**

- Page 16 Floorscape, street furniture and other features
- Please could you amend the first paragraph to state that both the K6 telephone boxes on the High Street have been converted to house a defibrillator each and neither contain a telephone.
- They are regularly maintained by members of the former Ketton First

- Noted and document amended accordingly.

- Responders.

#### Representation 11:

- There is a proposal to include the field located between 6 and 8 High Street.
- In the 2013 RCC local plan, this exact field was identified as a site ideal for housing (see inset 27, brown area H4) How can an unremarkable field (which has no public access) in the centre of the village which has previously been identified as ideal for housing be suddenly earmarked for conservation?

- The field does have some interest in terms of the townscape along High Street acting as an attractive green buffer in the streetscene. Given that the southern portion of the site is already within the conservation area and shares the same characteristics as the upper portions of the site, it would therefore be appropriate to include this area to rationalize the boundary.

#### Representation 12:

- “The gate to Number 54 High Street is currently being used as an informal noticeboard and would benefit from being removed or a more formal noticeboard located elsewhere.”
- To the best of my knowledge, over a fifty year period since the inception of the conservation zone, the information on this gate has advertised only the very best in local Ketton community life, including especially church and charity events and outreach endeavours to enhance inclusive values within the village. It is quite inappropriate and somewhat adversarial that this one location should be singled out with its obvious community focus when all manner of informal advertising is to be found on lamp posts, telegraph poles and other gates all within the conservation zone.

- Noted – will amend as necessary.

#### Representation 13:

- We live at Hunts Lane, which is one of the properties to be included in the new area, along with numbers 1 and 2 and the Paddock. We regard this as a positive development. However, looking at the map of the boundaries we just wanted to highlight that the hedge running down our southwestern boundary, actually forms our boundary and our deeds indicate that it belongs to us. We would like this hedge to be explicitly included in the conservation area. The hedge has suffered from neglect in recent years due to lack of management of the adjacent farm track but we have recently planted in the gaps with native hedging plants.

- I have checked and the hedge is included in the boundary of the conservation area.

#### **Representation 14:**

Supports the following:

- To designate a new conservation area in Geeston, forming a smaller character zone of Ketton.
- To extend the conservation area to include the former railway station building, Station Road
- To extend the conservation area to include 'The Paddock' on Hunts Lane, and Nos. 1-3 Hunts Lane.
- To extend the conservation area to include the field between No. 6 and No. 8 High Street.
- To extend the conservation area all the property boundary associated with No. 11 and No. 12 Aldgate.
- To extend the conservation area to include Nos. 1-12A Ketco Avenue and the main office at the Northern section of Ketco Avenue associated with Hanson Cement Works.

- Support noted.

#### **Representation 15:**

- All the enhancement proposals for the village as a whole are welcomed. In particular a recommendation about tidying up street clutter. I realize your current LA budget constraints will put this well down the priority list but the changes would be welcomed as soon as you are able to execute
- The design guidance is also welcomed as even contemporary development can be done in a sympathetic way. It is the lack of this in the past which has marred Geeston and cannot be reversed.

- Support noted.

- The creation of an extended character zone in Geeston around a historic core is well overdue and very welcome and I note my cottage has now been designated one of several buildings of local importance in Geeston. I hope this means the Council is appreciative of my previous commitment to the character of the area and maintenance of the Collyweston roof at considerable personal expense.
- I have one major negative point to make about the Council's lax attitude to approvals which some years ago allowed tandem development of number 27B Geeston to the rear of my property. This has massively impacted on the quality of the environment of my home because the Council allowed a revision to planning permission for a single story building to a two story building. The introduction of the conservation area of Geeston and designation of my house has come too late for me.

- Comments noted regarding development deemed inappropriate or unsympathetic. The production of the appraisal does not prevent development but will help to provide parameters around ensuring development is appropriate to the historic context.

**Representation 16:**

- The appraisal does not acknowledge enough the special interest of Hibbons House and its contribution to the special interest of the area.

- Comments noted regarding Hibbons House – action for conservation team to consider inclusion on the national list of historic buildings.

**Representation 17:**

- Support proposal to extend the Ketton Conservation Area and also warmly welcomed by my neighbours at Pinfold Gate.

- Support noted.

**'Mini consultation'**

**1. Parish Council:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Planning Committee broadly agree with the proposed updates. However, they are disappointed that the Ketco Avenue buildings, avenue of trees &amp; the main office building are no longer included in the proposed Conservation Area. (discussed at public planning meeting 21st January 2020)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support noted for proposed updates.</li> <li>Note disappointment to the removal of buildings along Ketco Avenue, avenue of trees and Main Office. Please refer to report for justification for this.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. <u>Savills, agent for Hanson Cement:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed amendments in relation to the properties and trees on Ketco Avenue are very much supported by our client.</li> <li>In relation to the potential to include these buildings as part of a 'local list' in the future, this is a matter which will be given due consideration by our client should this option be progressed via the Neighbourhood Plan group or local planning authority in the future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support noted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. <u>Ketton Neighborhood Development Plan Group</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area in Ketton. We are particularly pleased to see the extension of the boundary to include the Home Farm site, and Edmunds Drive.</li> <li>The map supplied does not show the entirety of the Geeston proposed conservation area. However, if this remains unchanged from the earlier draft of the Appraisal, we would support it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support noted.</li> <li>The map supplied only related to where there are proposed amendments. It is still intended to designate Geeston a Conservation Area as per initial consultation.</li> </ul>

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst we are pleased that the Conservation Area boundaries have been extended to cover the site known as H5, we remain disappointed that it has not been seen fit to include the adjacent orchard in the Conservation Area. We do not believe this is a logical or consistent decision. We would point out that the reason for including more of the field seems to be based on it being part of the 'environs' of the listed building Orchard House, which would be the same in the case of the orchard.</li> <li>We remain disappointed that despite the original proposal to include Ketco Avenue in the Conservation Area, this has now been removed. We do not understand the logic of this decision, and would point out the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ketco Avenue, together with its trees and the buildings on it, is clearly a distinctive part of the Ketton landscape and deserves to be recognised as such in the Conservation Area boundary;</li> <li>whilst the development at H7 might appear to separate it from the north-western section of the Conservation Area, it is nonetheless directly opposite the south-eastern section;</li> <li>In common with any other building/area with the Conservation Area boundary, its inclusion would not perse prevent development or change but rather ensure this was in keeping with the rest of the village and the village's heritage. In fact you make this same point in your comments about the Home Farm development in your covering letter.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>We note your suggestion that the Neighbourhood Plan might include this as part of a "Local List".</p><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would once again note that, in relation to the Conservation Area, we feel it is appropriate to identify "Areas of Important Open Space" which although not within the boundary have a significant impact on the appreciation of the Conservation Area. We would argue that their close proximity to the Conservation Area and their own intrinsic contribution to the appreciation of the landscape and the Conservation Area itself mean that in respect of such areas, the Conservation Area boundary should not be seen as impermeable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two areas we would include in this category are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the field on the south side of the railway line at the start of Barrowden Road ("Upper Priory Field");</li> <li>The fields south-east of the Conservation Area boundary adjacent to the River Chater (Bull Lane to the Fish Ponds).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note disappointment not to include the 'orchard' please refer to report for justification for this.</li> <li>This point is made in relation to Home Farm which has a different context to Ketco Avenue. Home Farm is located within the centre of the conservation area, Ketco Avenue is not.</li> <li>Historic England guidance on conservation areas goes against designating large areas of land surrounding the conservation area, however it is recognized that these form part of its setting and this should be given due consideration in the planning process. Appraisal amended to include information regarding the importance of setting.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

<p><b><u>Representation 6 (Further comments following mini consultation):</u></b></p> <p>If the Paddock and outbuilding on Hunts Lane are included in the conservation area will it be of any benefit to us?</p> <p>Would our beneficiaries be restricted if they wished to apply for planning permission in the future</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The private benefits of conservation area designation is that it increases the value of your property according to Historic England research by the London School of Economics, 2012. It will also help to improve the character and appearance of an area.</li> <li>• Permitted development rights remain in the conservation area meaning that small scale changes can be undertaken without planning permission. Additionally the main controls in a conservation area relate to demolition – therefore the extra controls are not prohibitive or overly restrictive.</li> </ul>